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OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Association was held at the Radisson Hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota on August 16, 1969. Approximately sixty Compact Administrators, deputies and other officials from thirty-nine jurisdictions attended. A list of registrants is attached as Appendix A.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Paul C. Wolman, President of the Association and Compact Administrator for Maryland. Compact Administrator T.E. Telander of Minnesota welcomed the delegates to his state.

Mr. Wolman gave the President's report. He referred to the plaque presented on behalf of the Association to its former counsel, Dr. Mitchell Wendell, and read a letter of appreciation from him. Mr. Wolman mentioned also the special committee he had appointed to study parole revocation problems and called attention to the fact that it would be reporting later in the day.

Mr. Charles H. Lawson, Treasurer of the Association and Compact Administrator for Florida, submitted the Treasurer's report. It was referred to the Auditing Committee. See Appendix B for the Treasurer's report.

The Minutes of the 1968 meeting were approved as distributed.

Mr. William L. Frederick, Eastern Regional Director of the Council of State Governments, presented the Secretariat's report. See Appendix C. With reference to his report, mention was made of the fact that legislation has been drafted for introduction in Congress to make the District of Columbia party to the Compact. Subsequently, the Association passed a resolution supporting the proposed legislation. See Appendix E for text of the resolution.

Mr. Wolman appointed the following committees: Nominating: Mr. Telander, Minnesota Chairman; Mr. Gernert, Pennsylvania; Mr. Stephens, Alabama; Mr. Grout, Colorado; Mr. Bobzin, Iowa; Resolutions: Mr. Spangler, California, Chairman; Mr. Morse, Vermont; Mr. Hurley, Kentucky; Mr. Canary, South Dakota; Mr. Moore, South Carolina; Auditing: Mr. Davis, Massachusetts, Chairman; Mr. Drew, Arizona.

DISCUSSION SESSION

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PAROLE REVOCATION HEARINGS

Mr. Walter G. Sartorius, Chairman of the Committee and Compact Administrator for Missouri, presented the Report of the Committee. The Report was discussed in detail. Following the discussion, the Report was approved with some minor amendments and the deletion of a recommendation and supporting material relating to on-site hearings. The Executive Committee was directed to implement various recommendations made by the Committee. The text of the Committee Report as approved appears in Appendix D. A summary of the discussion concerning the report follows.

1. Arrest and Detention

It was agreed that many states already have authority to detain alleged violators in Compact cases pending the arrival of a warrant from the sending state. Some Compact Administrators, however, lack this authority and difficulties sometimes develop as a result. There was a consensus that an amendment to the Compact was not necessary
to solve this problem but that states in which the authority to detain a Compact violator was uncertain or lacking should seek a favorable legal opinion on this point or amend their statutes to give such authority to the Compact Administrator.

2. Parole Regulations

It was agreed that a high degree of uniformity among the states in the basic rules and regulations governing parolees was desirable. Interstate parolees are expected to observe the rules of both sending and receiving states and these may differ. It is essential that any parolee being sent out-of-state under the Compact have a clear understanding of the rules by which he must abide. Any claim of violation must be related specifically to these rules. Greater uniformity of rules among the states would eliminate many problems in Compact cases and provide a sounder basis for revocation in those cases in which it becomes necessary. Accordingly, the Association should draft minimum basic rules and regulations applicable in all states, recognizing that additional rules may be necessary in some states as a result of statutes or established policies.

3. Violations Documented

The recommendation that a new Compact form be prepared to provide for a detailed record of violations was approved. It was noted that challenges to revocation proceedings may be upheld if violation records are vague or incomplete or not well documented. Action in revocation hearings should be based on well substantiated reports of violations of specific rules rather than on general statements that the overall conduct of the parolee has not been satisfactory.

4. On-Site Hearings

The Committee recommended that each state provide for on-site hearings on alleged violations by a parole officer or supervisor before action is taken to revoke parole. In the discussion, reference was made to Hysler v. Reed, (318 F. 2d 225, 1963), which imposed such a requirement with regard to violations by federal parolees Compact Administrators from some states reported that they presently follow such procedures. Some also noted that their states permit attorneys to represent parolees at revocation hearings and that this practice has not been detrimental in any way. A number of Administrators, however, expressed the view that a requirement for on-site hearings would pose serious administrative problems because of heavy case loads and other factors and that such hearings were not necessary if detailed violation reports were provided. After lengthy discussions, the Committee's recommendation on this matter was turned down and this section of its Report was deleted from the document as finally approved.

5. Returning the Violator

There was no dissent from the general recommendation that the sending state has an obligation to return any violator at the request of the receiving state. There was agreement also with the Committee's suggestions that the receiving state should use discretion in requesting return or revocation, particularly when time remaining on parole is short, or the parolee's resources are all in the receiving state, or the nature of the offense is minor. There was discussion also of the possibilities, in lieu of return, of concurrent supervision; out-of-state incarceration, when state statutes permit; or, as one member of the Committee suggested, of allowing parole time to run during a new sentence. The Committee's suggestion that some agreement
that others continued to follow it. All Compact Administrators, he said, should make every effort to impress upon courts and other local agencies the need to follow Compact procedures and give proposed receiving states an opportunity to make necessary investigations before approving out-of-state probation.

FAILURE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS BEFORE REJECTING CASES AND FAILURE TO REPLY TO COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Denton commented that a few states summarily reject requests for investigations of absconders. This practice, he noted, has a detrimental effect on interstate cases generally and makes it impossible for a sending state to fulfill its responsibilities with reference to absconders. Likewise, the failure of some jurisdictions to respond to correspondence concerning cases impedes efforts to utilize the Compact effectively.

SUPERVISION IN NON SUPPORT CASES AND IN MISDEMEANOR CASES

Mr. J. Rufus Strother, Deputy Compact Administrator for Probation in North Carolina, reported that his office sometimes experiences difficulties when it requests other states to supervise persons placed on probation for non-support. He emphasized that North Carolina did not expect other states to undertake the collection of support payments in these cases, but it did believe that supervision of the offender was desirable. It was noted that in many states non-support is a civil and not a criminal matter, and therefore, persons charged with non-support are not handled under the Compact. Also, responsibility for these cases frequently is vested in domestic relations courts with which Compact Administrators have no relationships. It was agreed, however, that a person found guilty of a criminal charge of non-support and placed on probation is eligible for supervision under the Compact.

With regard to supervision of misdemeanants, Mr. Strother also reported that some states refuse to accept such cases. Reference was made to a policy position taken by the Association in 1965 declaring that misdemeanants are eligible for supervision under the Compact. Sending states should not request supervision for all misdemeanants permitted to go to other states, but receiving states should attempt to comply with requests for supervision to the degree deemed necessary by sending states.

FAILURE TO SEND TIMELY PROGRESS REPORTS

Mr. Strother noted that some jurisdictions neglect to send progress reports on cases they are supervising. In such situations, the court in the sending state lacks the information needed to determine how long probation should be continued.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION

Dr. E. Preston Sharp, General Secretary of the ACA, referred to various matters of concern to the organization and to the field of corrections. He mentioned the self-study which ACA had undertaken and the need to strengthen the organized professional voice of corrections. As part of this effort, ACA is continuing its work toward the development of a voluntary accreditation program for correctional workers. Dr. Sharp mentioned also the need to improve recruitment procedures. He called attention to the National Registry for Correctional Services as one resource for recruitment and to current efforts to interest military personnel who are leaving the armed forces in careers in corrections.
ACA also is trying to strengthen its services so that it can be of greater assistance to persons in the field. As one example, Dr. Sharp mentioned new material to be included in the directory of institutions and agencies, including information on work release programs and whether parole boards are full time or part time. (The Compact Administrators strongly supported these proposed additions to the directory). He also referred to ACA's role in providing consultant services at the request of states and noted that this activity was increasing as state criminal justice planning and work proceeds under the Omnibus Crime Control Act.

Dr. Sharp stressed the necessity for correctional officials to take leadership in the new programs now underway and to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the increased public concern about law enforcement and corrections. They should not, he said, allow other professions to make decisions about the future of corrections nor permit themselves to be relegated to a secondary role in the development of new concepts and programs in the criminal justice field. Top federal officials, he concluded, are deeply concerned about corrections; now the correctional profession must demonstrate its ability and willingness to move ahead with more effective programs and policies for the treatment and rehabilitation of offenders.

INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Roy Nelson suggested that some states apparently grant out-of-state passes when actually they intend to transfer the parolee or probationer. This practice makes it difficult for the receiving state to conduct a meaningful investigation before acting on the transfer request because the individual already is present in the state. He urged states not to utilize out-of-state passes for this purpose.

MINIMUM TIME REQUIRED ON PAROLE OR PROBATION

Mr. Walter Sartorius referred to the fact that state laws and policies differ as to the minimum time a person must spend on parole or probation before he is eligible for discharge. Knowledge of these requirements can be important to receiving states. Accordingly, he made a motion which was adopted that the Secretariat conduct a survey to obtain information from the states on this matter and incorporate the findings in the Compact Administrators' Manual.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Mr. Robert Trimble, Assistant to the Executive Director of NCOD, presented this report. He emphasized that NCOD's programs and services are moving ahead and expanding, though lack of funds in the amount expected has delayed some projects. The program service bureau has proved its value in enlisting the support of many national organizations in crime and delinquency programs. Civic groups as well as business, labor and professional organizations are an invaluable resource and are providing great assistance in many areas.

The professional council of NCOD is being enlarged and its functions broadened to include all segments of the criminal justice system. A new council of correctional services is being created to concentrate on this field. Also NCOD has established a national affairs committee composed of prominent citizens to be active in the area of national legislation relating to crime and delinquency.
COMPACT BROCHURE

Mr. Joseph A. Spangler, Compact Administrator for California, proposed that the brochure describing the Compact which the Association published in 1964 be rewritten so as to make it more pertinent for judges and parole officers. His motion that the Executive Committee undertake this task was approved.

FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

NEXT ANNUAL MEETING

The members indicated a desire to hold the 1970 Annual Meeting in conjunction with the Congress of Corrections in Cincinnati. The Executive Committee subsequently voted approval of this preference. The 1970 Annual Meeting will be at the Sheraton Gibson Hotel in Cincinnati, Ohio on October 10.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

Mr. Davis reported that the Treasurer's accounts were in order. The report of the Auditing Committee was approved.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Spangler presented the report of the Resolutions Committee which was approved. See Appendix E for the text of the resolutions.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. Telander presented the report of the Nominating Committee. Its report was accepted and the following officers were declared elected.

President: George F. Denton, Ohio
Vice President: Joseph A. Spangler, California
Treasurer: Charles H. Lawson, Florida

Executive Committee

Paul C. Wolman, Maryland, Chairman
G. Raymond Nichols, Maine
Roy H. Nelson, Michigan
J. Curtis Moore, South Carolina
Don W. McGehee, Tennessee
William R. Conte, Washington

Executive Council

Charles P. Chew, Virginia
Libby M. Gardner, Kentucky
J. Raymond Bills, Missouri
Eugene E. Neal, Nebraska
Russell G. Oswald, New York
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Registration List

ALABAMA

* L. B. Stephens, Board of Pardons and Paroles
David H. Williams, Board of Pardons and Paroles

ALASKA

* T. R. Branton, Director, Division of Corrections
Russell Moody, Deputy Compact Administrator, Division of Corrections

ARIZONA

* Allen Cook, Director, Department of Corrections
William M. Drew, Chief, Division of Paroles

CALIFORNIA

* Joseph A. Spangler, California Adult Authority

COLORADO

Donald D. Alders, Parole Agent
John P. Dolan, Parole Agent
* Edward W. Grout, Executive Director, Department of Parole
Harry C. Tinsley, Chief, Division of Corrections

CONNECTICUT

Paul J. Eubanks, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Corrections

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Carl D. Coleman, Chairman, Board of Parole
H. Albion Ferrell, Member, Board of Parole

FLORIDA

* Charles H. Lawson, Probation and Parole Commission

GEORGIA

Edward Kendrick, Director of Probation
*Bettye P. Young, State Board of Pardons and Paroles

HAWAII

Harlan Wong, Supervisor, Board of Paroles and Pardons

* Means Compact Administrator
INDIANA
Marjorie Barker, Deputy Compact Administrator

IOWA
*R. W. Bobzin, Parole Executive, Bureau of Adult Correction Services

KENTUCKY
Libby M. Gardner, Deputy Compact Administrator
*W. P. Hurley, Director of Probation and Parole

LOUISIANA
*Garland M. Bonin, Commissioner, Department of Welfare
Curvey P. Landry, Director of Probation and Parole

MAINE
*G. Raymond Nichols, Director, Probation and Parole

MARYLAND
*Paul C. Wolman, Director, Department of Parole and Probation

MASSACHUSETTS
*Martin P. Davis, Director of Parole Service
C. Eliot Sands, State Commissioner of Probation

MICHIGAN
Roy H. Nelson, Deputy Director, Bureau of Field Services

MINNESOTA
Darrell R. Pangborn, Supervisor, Interstate Services
*T. F. Teland, Chairman, Adult Corrections Commission

MISSOURI
J. Raymond Bills, Deputy Compact Administrator
*Walter G. Sartorius, Chairman, Board of Probation and Parole
James Toner, Associate Director, Dismas House

NEBRASKA
*Eugene E. Neal, State Probation Officer, Board of Pardons

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Robert A. Johnson, State Parole Officer, Board of Parole

* Means Compact Administrator
NEW MEXICO
*Dr. Manuel N. Brown, Director, Adult Probation-Parole Division

NORTH CAROLINA
J. Rufus Strother, Deputy Compact Administration for Probation

NORTH DAKOTA
*Irvin Riedman, Director, Parole Office

OHIO
*George F. Denton, Chief of the Adult Parole Authority

OKLAHOMA
E. C. Grandstaff, Deputy Director, Department of Corrections

PENNSYLVANIA
*Paul J. Gernert, Chairman, Board of Probation and Parole

RHODE ISLAND
*Walter W. Siwicki, Administrator, Bureau of Probation and Parole

SOUTH CAROLINA
*J. Curtis Moore, Director, Probation, Pardon and Parole Board

SOUTH DAKOTA
*Arthur L. Canary, Executive Director, Board of Pardons and Paroles

TENNESSEE
*Don W. McGehee, Director, Division of Probation and Paroles

TEXAS
Edward Barkley, Area Supervisor, Board of Pardons and Paroles

UTAH
Kenneth H. Dent, District Supervisor, Department of Adult Probation and Parole

VIRGINIA
James W. Phillips, Member, Probation and Parole Board

* Means Compact Administrator
be reached as to what constituted "a short time remaining on parole" was approved.

6. The Returned Violator

It was agreed, as stated by the Committee, that returned interstate violators should be treated exactly the same as intrastate cases. All procedures which apply to intrastate cases also should apply to cases returned from other states.

SHOULD INFORMATION REGARDING ABSCONDERs BE PLACED ON THE LAW ENFORCEMENT NETWORK COMPUTE?

Mr. Roy H. Nelson, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Field Services in Michigan, explained that whenever his state issues an arrest warrant the pertinent information is placed on the law enforcement information network which is tied into the National Crime Information Center. Often this leads to quick apprehension of the person being sought. He asked whether receiving states could take similar action in the case of absconders, but noted that if they did so, the sending state would have to report promptly if it decided for any reason to withdraw its warrant.

Discussion revealed that states follow various practices with respect to absconders. Some have systems which enable them to be aware of absconders quickly; others do not. A motion was adopted that every state should investigate without delay any report of an absconder by another state.

INTERSTATE CORRESPONDENCE

Compact Administrator Telander referred to difficulties which are encountered when correspondence, including copies, contains no readily identifiable indication of the state involved. He suggested that handling of correspondence would be facilitated if the name and address of the sender were placed prominently at the beginning of each letter or form.

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE INSTITUTES AND UNIFORM PAROLE REPORTING PROJECT

Mr. Paul J. Gernert, Compact Administrator for Pennsylvania, reported that all states are cooperating in the parole reporting project. It has already proved its value. Funds are available to continue the project for another two years after which time it is expected that the continuing collection of data in this field will be undertaken as part of a broad criminal statistics survey to be conducted by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Mr. Gernert noted that no national parole or probation institute was held during the past year so that the appropriation of $250.00 authorized by the Association for this purpose a year ago was not utilized. A motion was adopted approving the payment of a similar amount during the coming year if needed to help defray the costs of such an institute. By the same motion, Mr. Francis Bridges of Florida was re-designated as the Association's representative on the group responsible for planning the institutes.

ROLE OF THE COMPACT ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE WITH REGARD TO PROBATIONERS

Mr. George F. Denton, Compact Administrator for Ohio, referred to the fact that probationers often are sent to other states without giving the receiving state an opportunity to investigate the proposed placements. He indicated that during the past year he had been successful in getting some states to stop this practice but
VERMONT

Ivan Van Bree, Member, Board of Parole  
Raymond A. Giroux, Member, Board of Parole  
*Rudolph H. Morse, Executive Secretary, Board of Parole

WASHINGTON

Robert Dysart, Supervisor, Department of Probation and Parole

WISCONSIN

Lester E. Wogahn, District Supervisor, Bureau of Probation and Parole

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

George J. Reed, Chairman, U. S. Board of Parole

OTHERS

E. Preston Sharp, American Correctional Association  
Robert Trimble, National Council on Crime and Delinquency

COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

William L. Frederick, Director, Eastern Office  
Elizabeth Sicherman, Secretary to Mr. Frederick

* Means Compact Administrator
APPENDIX B

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

July 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969

CHECKING ACCOUNT - THE TALLAHASSEE BANK & TRUST CO., TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH RECEIPTS</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash rec'd from Saul H. Clark, 9-3-68</td>
<td>Council of State Governments $ 593.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'd check from Saul H. Clark, for saving's</td>
<td>Expenses incurred by Jane Parks and Wm. L. Frederick at Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate</td>
<td>meeting 9-18-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues for 1968-69</td>
<td>General Office Equipment &amp; Printing Company, Ledger outfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-3-68</td>
<td>San Francisco Hilton Hotel 436.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-19-68</td>
<td>Luncheon 313.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15-68</td>
<td>Executive Dinner 123.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues for 69-70</td>
<td>9-24-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as of June 30, 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rec'd on Saving's Account</td>
<td>Joint Commission on Corr. 150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24-68</td>
<td>Manpower and Training, Assoc. contribution 9-18-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-30-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rec'd, Saving's Certificate</td>
<td>Genovese Press, Inc. 385.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24-68</td>
<td>Multigraphing, Mimeographing and supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-24-69</td>
<td>Joe Spangler, plaque for Mitch Wendell 10-16-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary expense 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherry Colvin 7.50 12-24-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Garber 7.50 1-2-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash Balance, June 30, 1969 2,820.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checking 690.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings 54.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saving Certificate 2,075.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY                         | $4,455.82                                          |

|                                                                       | $4,455.82                                          |
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THE GENOVESE PRESS, INC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE PAID</th>
<th>INVOICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-8-68</td>
<td>#4414</td>
<td>$17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-24-68</td>
<td>#4440</td>
<td>149.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24-68</td>
<td>#4499</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24-68</td>
<td>#4512</td>
<td>132.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-30-69</td>
<td>#4702</td>
<td>19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-30-69</td>
<td>#4767</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-22-69</td>
<td>#4879</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11-69</td>
<td>#5049</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-26-69</td>
<td>#5078</td>
<td>15.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $385.12
### 1969 - 70 MEMBERSHIP DUES PAID

As of June 30, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA (PROBATION)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$675.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Secretariat's Report

There have been several developments during the past year pertaining to the Compact and related matters which may be of interest to you.

First, we understand that legislation will be introduced in the current session of Congress to make the District of Columbia a party to the Compact. We, of course, will be prepared to lend any possible assistance in support of such legislation on behalf of the Association. A similar bill making the District party to the Interstate Compact on Juveniles has passed the House.

Two recent court decisions have been reported to us pertaining to the Compact. The Ohio Court of Appeals recently ruled that probation officers may arrest persons being supervised under the Compact without a warrant. Compact Administrator Denton has sent copy of this decision to all Compact Administrators. The citation is, In re Petition of Mathews, 18 Ohio App. 2d 155 (1969).

The New Jersey Supreme Court declared unconstitutional municipal ordinances requiring felons to register. The citation to this decision, which we reported in Compact Newsletter 74 is, New Jersey v. John Ulesky, 56 N.J. 26 (1969).

As always, we would much appreciate it if each of you would be certain to report to us any court decisions or opinions of your Attorney General concerning the Compact.

The Interstate Compact on Juveniles, which this Association helped to develop, was ratified this year by North Dakota. There are now 47 states party to this Compact; the only exceptions are Georgia, New Mexico and South Carolina.

The Agreement on Detainers was ratified this year by Delaware, Oregon and Wisconsin. Twenty-two states now have ratified this Compact. In addition, bills have been introduced in the current session of Congress, H.R. 2172 and H.R. 6951, to provide for participation by the federal government and the District of Columbia in the Agreement.

The new Compact on Mentally Disordered Offenders was ratified this year by New Hampshire. Six states, Illinois, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island and South Dakota, now have ratified it.

Also in the field of corrections, action was taken this year in at least two states, Delaware and Vermont, to ratify an Interstate Corrections Compact, which is similar to the existing New England and Western Corrections Compacts.

Last year you requested that we draft legislation giving state parole agencies authority to supervise and investigate probation cases in states in which there is no central probation agency. After careful consideration we concluded it was not feasible to draft model legislation of this sort because any such authority would have to be tied closely to the existing authority of the parole agency.

A number of states have not as yet completed and returned to us the statistical reporting forms for the year ending June 30, 1969. We would much appreciate it if those of you who have not yet done so would do so in the very near future so that we can compile the statistics for all of you.
PAROLE AND PROBATION COMPACT ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE PAROLE REVOCATION

The Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers provides that any sending state may at all times enter a receiving state and retake any person on probation or parole. No formalities are required beyond establishing the authority of the sending state officer, and the identity of the person to be retaken. The Compact also requires that parolees and probationers accepted in a receiving state shall receive the same kind and degree of supervision that is accorded to its own probationers and parolees. Herein lies the root of the very knotty and troublesome problems encountered in parole revocation of interstate cases.

Revocation procedures vary among the signatory states. Rules and regulations imposed in some states are non-existent in others. Interstate probationers and parolees are frequently expected to obey the rules of both the sending and receiving states. Parole and probation officers are empowered to arrest and detain alleged violators -- their own as well as Compact cases -- in some states, while in other states cannot do so without first obtaining a warrant from the sending state. Revocation hearings are required by statute in some states, with provision by statute or agency policy for appearance of retained counsel and voluntary witnesses. At least one state, by statute, provides for "on site" violation hearings; the appointment of counsel for the indigent; the Attorney General shall represent the state at such hearings; requires the recording of proceedings; gives the parolee immunity from prosecution on the basis of his testimony; and permits the Board to subpoena witnesses and pay their expenses.

The problems engendered by varying and often contradictory statutes and agency policies among the several states create a void in interstate procedures. Hopefully, in future years this can be overcome nationwide. The Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association recommends that:

(1) ARREST AND DETENTION

State statutes be modified to authorize the receiving state's parole agency and its officers to arrest and detain the sending state's parolee and to hold him in custody until a comprehensive violation report can be submitted to the sending state and appropriate decision made by the sending state.

(2) PAROLE REGULATIONS

Minimum basic rules and regulations applicable in all states be determined by an ad hoc committee of the Compact Administrators, with the provision that additional rules may be added by the sending or receiving states as statutes and agency policy may require.

Alleged violations must be specific acts and contrary to specific conditions of parole as imposed by the sending state and/or the receiving state. Conditions of parole must be written in clear, simple and straightforward language. The parolee must be thoroughly briefed as to the rules and regulations, both prior to leaving the sending state and upon arrival in the receiving state. The parolee's signature shall be obtained on the parole release document of the sending state, and a similar document of the receiving state. Any exceptions, additions or deletions to the
prescribed document must be specifically noted where parole agencies and officers have such authority to amend or modify in light of the treatment needs of the parolee. A typewritten statement listing such modifications, amendments, deletions or additions should be signed and dated by the parolee and officer, with appropriate copies for the receiving and sending states, as well as the parolee. Since it is the supervising officer who will write a violation report, he must be in a position to document directly the briefing of conditions given by him to the parolee, as well as any changes or modifications he has established.

(3) VIOLATIONS DOCUMENTED

A form be developed for use in Compact cases to outline in some detail the nature of alleged violations.

Alleged acts of violation must be substantiated and documented. Vague or indefinite statements in the violation report; such as, "I believe," "It has been reported," "I am informed," "It seems to be," will subject the report to the defense of being arbitrary or capricious in a court challenge of parole violation. The violation report must have specific dates, time, place, names and addresses, credibility and motivation of witnesses and informants before there is a sound basis for revocation consideration. Such must be specifically applicable to each and every rule violation alleged. Statements of the informants should be taken, preferably written, but certainly orally, and attached or included in the violation report. An example of this is the police report, if the parolee has been arrested by the police and charged with an offense.

It is recommended that parole revocation consideration be limited to one, two or three specific violations that are well substantiated and documented. There may well be a half dozen or more violations charged, and all contribute to the overall picture of failure or lack of successful parole adjustment. These should also certainly be considered in the total evaluation of the degree of risk to society. However, a shotgun approach to revocation for violation of parole conditions is certainly much weaker than one or two well detailed and documented violations, and becomes much more subject to accusation by the parolee of arbitrary and capricious action against him.

(4) RETURNING THE VIOLATOR

The sending state should return every parole violator from a receiving state when the receiving state so requests.

Obviously it is neither practical nor feasible to return a violator who has but a short time remaining on his sentence, and particularly if the violations are of a minor or technical nature, or his resources are in the receiving state. We need to determine some acceptable guide lines as to what is a "short time remaining on his sentence" — 30, 60, 90 days? Available funds for return of violators is a practical and real consideration; yet, if and when an agreement is reached on the question of "short time remaining," then it becomes the responsibility of every state to endeavor to secure the funds necessary to return violators. Very little is more detrimental to the philosophy of parole in the eyes of the public than to refuse or be unable because of funds to return a violator; and to the parolee and the inmates of a correctional institution this states, "You can get by with it," and "They don't mean what they tell you."

- 16 -
APPENDIX D

Discretion must be used by the receiving state in requesting revocation of parole, and consideration given to time on sentence remaining; nature and degree of risk posed by the violation; location and extent of the parolee's resources; local incarceration for minor misdemeanors, including "jail therapy," etc. Each case must be viewed individually in the light of protection of the community and the rehabilitative potential of the individual.

Apparently some states will revoke a parole on an out-of-state case and provide that the warrant will be executed only if the violator re-enters the sending state. The Compact Administrators' Association should go on record condemning this practice of "dumping." Any revocation, based on strong enough reasons to revoke, should then not allow the parolee to be free from his violation, or from supervision.

In some instances a receiving state may request revocation in lieu of prosecution for a new offense. This would be appropriate, providing the parolee admits to the offense; the details and his participation are well documented; and he clearly understands he is to be returned as a violator in lieu of new prosecution. This is essential if following his return to the sending state he then contests his revocation; and particularly so if technical violations are not alleged and substantiated in the violation report -- where the only violation charged is the alleged commission of a new offense.

When an out-of-state case is sentenced for a new offense in the receiving state, the sending state will frequently revoke his parole, or stop his time on the sending state's sentence, and a detainer usually follows. This normally results in a maximum security assignment in the receiving state's correctional institution, which may be unnecessary, and a beneficial program may be denied to him. It becomes quite important, therefore, that an early decision be reached between the sending and receiving states as to the possibility of concurrent supervision following parole release on the new conviction in the receiving state. It would seem essential that the initiative be taken by the receiving state, since they will have knowledge of the prisoner, his attitudes, motivation and rehabilitative programs that could be available to him in their state's correctional institutions. The final decision relative to concurrent supervision remains the prerogative of the sending state and can be delayed until the receiving state is about ready to release under supervision, as long as the prisoner is fully aware of his status with the sending state and recognizes that concurrent supervision or return to the sending state will be determined by his progress toward rehabilitation when confined in the receiving state.

(5) THE RETURNED VIOLATOR

Upon return to the sending state the violator should be accorded every consideration available to the sending state's parolees within the state. If a formal revocation hearing is authorized by statute, with retained counsel and voluntary witnesses, the interstate returned violator should have these same considerations. Any statutes, policies or procedures, and any decisions the parole board might make are as applicable to this parolee as to any other within the sending state's realm of authority, in accordance with the standards for such revocation proceedings, regardless of witnesses or attorneys.

W. G. Sartorius (Missouri) Chairman
Joseph A. Spangler (California)
Paul Wolman (Maryland)
Charles H. Lawson (Florida)
Sanger B. Powers (Wisconsin)
Paul J. Gernert (Pennsylvania)
Russell G. Oswald (New York)
Ellis C. MacDougall (Connecticut)
RESOLUTIONS

I

WHEREAS, legislation is expected to be introduced in the current session of Congress to make the District of Columbia a party to the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers; and

WHEREAS, participation in the Compact by the District would be of benefit to it and to the fifty states and two territories which have ratified the Compact;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association, meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 16, 1969, continue to pledge its support for passage of legislation to permit the District of Columbia to join the Compact.

II

WHEREAS, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association has had a most successful meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota on August 16, 1969;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association that:

1. President Paul C. Wolman be congratulated and commended for his year of leadership and dedication to the work of the Association;

2. Mr. Walter G. Sartorius and his Committee receive the thanks and appreciation of the Association for their report on interstate parole revocation;

3. Mr. T. F. Telanders, Compact Administrator for Minnesota, be thanked for the excellent arrangements he made as host for the meeting;

4. The Secretariat forward a letter of best wishes to Francis Bridges for a speedy recovery and letters of heartfelt condolences to the families of John Shea and John Mastin;

5. The Association again commends the Council of State Governments, and specifically, William L. Frederick and his staff, for their continuing efforts on behalf of the Compact and the Association.